

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THERESA BROOKE,
Plaintiff,
v.
RIHH LP,
Defendant.

Case No. [19-cv-06852-SI](#)

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION**

Re: Dkt. No. 28

On April 29, 2020, plaintiff filed a motion for administrative relief, requesting the Court extend the deadline for the parties to complete the joint site inspection that was originally ordered to be completed by February 2, 2020. Dkt. No. 28; *see also* Dkt. No. 4 (Scheduling Order). Plaintiff's two page motion gives no explanation why the joint site inspection was not completed on February 2. Rather, the motion states the "ground for the Motion relate to the Coronavirus and the Stay-at-Home Orders." Dkt. No. 28. Plaintiff's explanation is unpersuasive, because California's stay-at-home order was not issued until March 19, 2020. See <https://www.gov.ca.gov/2020/03/19/governor-gavin-newsom-issues-stay-at-home-order/>. Further, defendant raises valid points in its opposition, arguing a joint site inspection is not necessary as plaintiff has never actually been to the hotel's physical location, rather, she has only visited the website. Dkt. No. 29.

On this record, the Court hereby DENIES plaintiff's motion for administrative relief.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 11, 2020



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge